

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed May 18, 2005. Claims 16 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1-15, 17 and 19-20 remain pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges that the IDS filed on May 17, 2004 has been considered by the Examiner and made of record.

DRAWINGS

The undersigned also gratefully acknowledges that the drawings filed on June 22, 2004 have been accepted.

SPECIFICATION

An amendment has been made to each of paragraphs [0005] and [0034] in order to correct typographical errors.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the conditional allowance of Claims 2-5 and 13-16.

Pursuant to this indication, Claim 1 has been amended to substantially include the limitations recited in dependent Claim 4. The only exception being the use of the term

“coupling structure” instead of the term “bushing,” which is used in Claim 4. It is believed that Claim 1, as presently amended, is now clearly in form for allowance. Accordingly, Claims 2-5, which depend directly from Claim 1, are also believed to now be in allowable form.

It is believed that independent Claim 12 has also been amended in such a manner as to make Claim 12, as well as its dependent Claims 13-15, allowable in form. (See argument under “**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**” below.)

Claim 16 has been cancelled.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 12 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mihich (U.S. Pat. No. 4,953,932). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the above-described amendment to independent Claim 1, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is most respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments to independent Claims 12 and 17, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is most respectfully requested.

Initially, it will be noted that the language “a shaft for extending through both of said annular members for maintaining both of said annular members aligned along a common longitudinal axis” has been added to the end of Claim 12. This language is somewhat similar to that used to amend Claim 1. This structure is not shown or suggested by Mihich. Mihich makes use of a housing shell 16 (Figure 1), which resides outwardly of the fiber bundles 20 and 24. This is different from the present invention, which allows a coupling structure (e.g., a shaft) to extend through both of the annular

members to maintain the annular members aligned along a common longitudinal axis concentrically with one another. The present invention addresses the difficult problem of how to couple two optical elements, where one is rotating, but also where the optical elements are arranged in a circular or semicircular pattern. The present invention allows coupling of the two elements without the optical faces of each of the elements coming in contact with one another by the use of the coupling structure described in connection with Figures 2 and 6 of the application. As the Examiner will note, this structure extends through the two optical components and is aligned along the longitudinal axis about which the two components rotate.

With regard to independent Claim 17, this distinction has been noted in the new text added at the end of the claim. Claims 19 and 20 depend directly from newly amended Claim 17.

In view of these amendments, it is believed that Claims 12-15, 17 and 19-20 are also now clearly in form for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

ALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS 6-11

The allowance of Claims 6-11 is gratefully acknowledged.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 28, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/lf-s

G:\melchuk\7784\000600-000699\000654\Amendment due 8-18-05.doc